

Is There a Normal Order of Words in

Subordinate Clauses?

BY

FLORENCE E. HALE.

Submitted to the Department of Latin
and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Approved: Arthur T. Walker

Department of

July 19 1917.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Introduction:

- A. Reason for investigation: failure to find any rule for the normal order of words in a subordinate clause.
- B. Importance of such a rule.
 - 1. Latin had no punctuation.
 - 2. Inflections confuse and do not clarify a complex sentence.
- C. A tentative rule: that a subordinate clause open with the introductory word and close with the verb.
- D. Investigation to determine whether or not grammar statements about the beginning and the end of a subordinate clause cover the point.

Introduction: List of grammars examined.

- 1. Statements about the beginning of a subordinate clause are incomplete and contradictory.
- 2. There is no mention of the end of a subordinate clause.

Part I: Attempt to establish a rule for the order of words in a subordinate clause.

Introduction:

1. The material covered.
2. The method followed in the investigation.
- A. Table giving the percentage of subordinate clauses that open with the introductory word and close with the verb.
- B. Table showing that all kinds of introductory words normally stand at the first of their clauses.
- C. Table showing that the verb stands last more normally in subordinate clauses than in main clauses.

Conclusion: The rule established: a subordinate clause normally opens with the introductory word and closes with the verb.

Part II: Attempt to explain departures from this rule.

- A. Statements made by the grammars. (No mention made of the end of a subordinate clause.)
Summary of these statements.

B. Conclusions arising from this investigation.

1. Summary of the lines of inquiry pursued and the conclusions reached in this investigation.
2. Exposition of the evidence upon which these conclusions were based.

- a. Clauses irregular at the beginning that stand at the beginning of a sentence.
- b. Clauses irregular at the end that stand at the end of a sentence.
- c. Grammar statements tested.
(Here are included references to periodicals consulted.)
- d. The behavior of sum and verbs compounded with sum.
- e. Rhythm and its effect upon the end of a clause.
- f. Other suggested reasons for a subordinate clause not closing with the verb. (Listed as tentative topics for further study.)

The point from which this paper developed is simply this fact: I could not find in any grammar any statement of a normal order of words in a subordinate clause.

The question of word order assumes great importance in the Latin sentence because of the fact that the Romans used no punctuation. The question becomes vastly more important in a complex sentence, for this reason: the greater wealth of inflections which makes possible a greater freedom in the order of words in a simple or in a compound sentence becomes not a guide for clearness but rather a source of confusion in a complex sentence containing two or more complete sets of subjects and verbs, with the added unlimited possibility of objects and phrases and modifiers of all degrees of complexity. If, then, a guide for the order of the words in a subordinate clause be sought, the wealth of inflections offers no solution. Now it is evident that the speech and writings of the Romans must have been understood. By what means, then, were the elements belonging to a subordinate clause distinguished from those belonging to a main clause? If

such clearness could not be effected by inflectional endings or by punctuation there seems to remain but one means by which such clearness could be produced: namely, the order of the words of the sentence. And the simplest method by which the elements of a subordinate clause could be distinguished from those of the main clause would seem to be the inclusion between the introductory word of a subordinate clause and its verb all the elements belonging to that clause. I determined then to find out whether or not this method might be the one which was actually employed.

It would be natural to suppose that the subordinate clause, the largest subordinate unit in a sentence, would have been the first to attract attention when the order of the words in these various units was being examined. Instead it seems to have been given scant attention and the attention turned rather to the position of the noun and its modifiers, of that of the members of an Ablative Absolute construction and their modifiers, and the like. And the wonder of it is that this very solution I have just suggested for the order of words in subordinate clauses - the "tying into a single mass (like an algebraic quantity within brackets)", as Professor Hale puts it - has been advanced for just

such other sentence units as I have been mentioning. Yet even so, I find in no grammar or article I have examined any such explanation set forth to define the order of words in a subordinate clause. This fact is especially curious in the light of all the study and extreme care that has been put upon the subject of the arrangement of clauses in the sentence.

Failing to find in the grammars any statement of a normal order in a subordinate clause, I searched through them to see whether or not this point might be virtually covered by statements about the beginning and the end of a subordinate clause. I examined the following grammars:

Draeger, Historische Syntax der Lateinischen Sprache,

Lane, A Latin Grammar (Revised),

Allen, Manual of Latin Grammar.

(The above three grammars do not treat the subject of word order at all, though I understand that Professor Lane would have done so had he lived to complete his grammar.)

Allen and Greenough, New Latin Grammar;

Bennett, A Latin Grammar;

Burton, Latin Grammar;

Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar (Revised and enlarged by Gildersleeve and Lodge);
 Hale and Buck, A Latin Grammar;
 Harkness, Complete Latin Grammar;
 Kühner, Ausführliche Lateinische Grammatik;
 Madvig, A Latin Grammar (Woods' Translation);
 I include also a statement from Nutting, Advanced Latin Composition.

I found the following statements about the beginning of a subordinate clause:

Burton: Relative and interrogative words normally stand first in their clauses.

Gildersleeve: Interrogative Sentences begin with the interrogative, subordinate clauses with the leading particle or relative.

Hale: Relative pronouns and conjunctions stand first in their clauses.

Harkness: Conjunctions and relatives, when they introduce clauses, generally stand at the beginning of such clauses.

Kühner: Subordinate conjunctions (ut, cum, si, etc.) and pronouns (relative and interrogative) are regularly placed at the first of a subordinate clause.

Madvig: Relative words, which refer back to what precedes, can never (in prose) be dislodged from the first place.

These statements are obviously incomplete in that:

1. Some of the grammars do not mention at all the beginning of a subordinate clause.
2. The statements in those that do mention it are incomplete.
3. The statements are at variance among themselves.

There was no statement in any grammar about the end of a subordinate clause. If it should be argued that we ought to infer that the statements in the grammars of the normal order in a sentence apply also to that in subordinate clauses, the answer is plain; for every grammar is at great pains to assure us that this so-called "normal order" of the words in a sentence is so far disregarded in practice as to render the term meaningless.

Part I.

I now of course turned to the Latin writers themselves for an answer to my question: Does the introductory word of a subordinate clause normally stand first and the verb last in that clause?

The results of this investigation are based upon a continuous reading of Books I. and II. in Caesar's Gallic War (Meusel's edition), Cicero's First and Second

Orations against Catiline, and his Cato Maior de Senec-
tute.

Table I. summarizes all the subordinate clauses included in the material covered. For the sake of brevity and convenience in statement I have termed as "regular" those subordinate clauses which are opened by the introductory word or particle and are closed by the verb. All others are termed "irregular." I have taken account - in the figures placed within the parentheses - of those clauses which might, because of two introductory words or two complete sets of subjects and verbs, be counted as two clauses rather than as single clauses. To avoid confusion, however, I have set down only the percentages based upon the figures outside the parentheses.

Table I.: Subordinate Clauses.

	Clauses in which the verb does <u>not</u> stand at the end.	Clauses in which the in- troduct- ory word does <u>not</u> come first.	Clauses irregu- lar at <u>both</u> the begin- ning and the end.	Total number of ir- regular clauses.	Total number of sub- ordinate clauses.	Percent- age of subordi- nate clauses that are irregu- lar.
Caesar I. and II.	47 (48)	76 (86)	3	126(137)	812(907)	.155
Catiline I. and II.	41 (47)	36 (39)	1	78(87)	413(431)	.188
De Senec- tute	117(125)	38 (39)	6 (7)	161(171)	430(473)	.374
Totals	205(220)	150(164)	10(11)	365(395)	1655(1811)	.220

I wish to insert at this point a statement which I shall make at a later point in the paper: I have included among the clauses in which the introductory word does not come first, 85 (94) clauses in which the element that precedes the introductory word belongs at least as truly to the main clause as to the subordinate clause, and according to the convictions of several of the grammarians and of myself belongs in fact to the main clause and is placed first for reasons entirely apart from the reason supported by some, namely, that it belongs to the subordinate clause in common with the main clause. In a considerable number of these clauses so included, the elements placed first must obviously belong to the main clause; as, for example, in the following:

Caesar II, 29, 5: Ipsi erant ex Cimbris Teutonisque prognati, qui . . . VI. milia hominum . . . reliquerant. Hi post eorum obitum multos annos a finitimis exagitati, cum alias bellum inferrent, alias illatum defenderent, consensu eorum omnium pace facta hunc sibi domicilio locum delegerant.

Caesar II, 35, 3: Quas legationes Caesar . . .
 ad se reverti iussit. Ipse in Carnutes . .
 quaeque civitates propinquae iis locis erant,
 ubi bellum gesserat, legionibus in hiberna de-
 ductis in Italian profectus est;

De Senectute, 30: Cyrus quidem apud Xenophontem
 eo sermone quem moriens habuit, cum admodum
 senex esset, negat se . . .

For the sake of absolute fairness, however, I have included all such as irregular in this table, and by so doing have made the percentages of irregularities appear very much higher than they would otherwise. Since, even then, however, out of a total of 1655(1811) subordinate clauses only 365 (395) or .220 are irregular or, in other words .78 have the introductory word at the first and the verb at the last of the clause we may conclude that this latter order of words is the normal order in a subordinate clause. Yet before we come to such a conclusion it is necessary to show (1) that this statement holds true for all kinds of introductory words, and it is profitable to show (2) that the verb does, in fact and in practice, more normally stand last in a subordinate clause than in a main clause. These two considerations are taken up and proved in Table II. and III. immediately following.

Table II.

Part I.: Introductory word at the
beginning of the clause.

Introductory Words	Caesar I. and II.	Catiline I. and II.	De Senectute	Totals
Pronouns (Relative, (including Purpose, Interrogative, In- definite)	330(346)	195(212)	146(163)	671(721)
quod causal	51(60)	13(16)	12	76(88)
propterea quod	17(24)			17(24)
si	45(49)	52(61)	30	127(140)
velut si	1			1
quod si	7(8)	5(6)	5	17(19)
etsi	1		2	3
tametsi	1			1
sin	1	1	2	4
sicut		1	2	3
ut (uti)	124(150)	46(51)	64(77)	234(278)
ne	29(30)	8(9)	7(8)	44(47)
neve	2			2
nisi (ni)	3		5	8
cum	46(61)	30(38)	58(66)	134(165)
cum primum	1			1
praesertim cum	1			1
ubi	16(19)	2	1	19(21)
quam (after com- parative)	8		6	14
quamquam		5		5
tamquam			3	3

Table II.

Introductory word at the
beginning of the clause.

Introductory Words	Caesar I. and II.	Catiline I. and II.	De Senectute	Totals
postquam priusquam posteaquam	7		5	12
quam [with possum]	3			3
quam diu		2		2
quamvis			3	3
quin	9(10)		3	12(13)
quantus, -a, -um	8	1	2	11
qualis, -e	1		2	3
quare	4(5)			4(5)
quoad			2	2
quia		2	4	6
cur		1	4	5
num			2	2
ne (question)			1	1
utrum - an, (or one member)	3	1	1	5
quotiens		1		1
quando			1	1
dum	6(7)		6	12(13)
dum modo		3(4)		3(4)
quoniam	5(7)	3	5(7)	13(17)
quominus	1		1	2
unde	2		1	3
simul atque		1		1
atque	1			1
quasi			3(4)	3(4)
Substantive clauses (ut omitted)		3		3
Introductory word omitted			1	1

Table II.

Part II: Introductory word not at
the beginning of the clause.

Introductory Words	Caesar I. and II.	Catiline I. and II.	De Senectute	Totals
Pronouns (Relative, (including Purpose, Interrogative, In- definite)	8(9)	(1)	8	16(18)
quod causal	12(15)			12(15)
propterea quod				
si	8	15(16)	9	32(33)
velut si				
quod si				
etsi				
tametsi				
sin				
sicut		1		1
ut (uti)	14	9	3	26
ne	2		1	3
neve				
nisi (ni)	1	1(2)	4	6(7)
cum	28(32)	9	18(19)	55(60)
cum primum				
praesertim cum				
ubi	5(7)			5(7)
quam (after com- parative)	1		1	2
quamquam				
tamquam				

Table II.

Introductory word not at the
beginning of the clause.

Introductory Words	Caesar I. and II.	Catiline I. and II.	De Senectute	Totals
postquam				
priusquam				
posteaquam				
quam (with possum)				
quam diu				
quamvis				
quin				
quantus, -a, -um			(1)	(1)
qualis, -e				
quare				
quoad				
quia				
cur				
num				
ne (question)				
utrum - an (or one member)				
quotiens				
quando				
dum		2		2
dum modo				
quoniam				
quominus				
unde				
simul atque				
atque				
quasi				
Substantive clauses (<u>ut</u> omitted)				
Introductory word omitted				

Table III. *

Main Clauses				Subordinate Clauses		
	Total number of claus- es.	Clauses in which the verb does <u>not</u> stand <u>at</u> the end.	Percent- age of clauses that are irregu- lar at the end	Total number of claus- es.	Clauses in which the verb does <u>not</u> stand <u>at</u> the end.	Percentage of clauses that are ir- regular at the end.
Caesar I. and II.	496 (577)	73 (75)	.147	812 (907)	50 (51)	.061
Catiline I. and II.	445 (463)	146 (149)	.328	413 (431)	42 (48)	.101
De Senec- tute.	557 (563)	267 (269)	.479	430 (473)	123 (132)	.286
Totals	1498 (1603)	486 (493)	.324	1655 (1811)	215 (231)	.129

* The main clauses in this table do not include the infinitive clauses in indirect discourse.

I believe, then, that the results of my investigation prove that I may answer my question in the affirmative and may state it as a Rule that: The introductory word of a subordinate clause normally stands first and the verb last in that clause.

Part II.

Though I have now given an answer to my first question and so accomplished the aim I set before myself in undertaking this investigation, I have caused to arise a second question: Since there exists a normal order in subordinate clauses, why do not all subordinate clauses follow this order?

Determined to open the way at least for an investigation of this point, I turned first to the grammars to see whether or not they made any statements about any part of a subordinate clause which might constitute reasons for an order other than the one I have shown to be normal. I found the following statements about the beginning of a subordinate clause:

Bennett: A word serving as the common Subject or Object of the main clause and a subordinate one, stands before both;

a. The same is true also

1. When the Subject of the main clause is Object (Direct or Indirect) of a subordinate clause.
2. When the Subject of a subordinate clause is at the same time the Object (Direct or Indirect) of the main clause.

Words or Phrases referring to the preceding sentence or to some part of it, regularly stand first;

as, - [For the examples are what interests us here]-

id ut audivit, Corcyram demigravit;

eo cum Caesar venisset, timentes confirmat.

Burton: When the subject or object of the main and subordinate clauses is the same, or when the subject of one is the object (either direct or indirect) of the other, it usually stands at the beginning of the sentence

Emphasis is secured by putting a word in a position in the clause [since he does not specify the kind of a clause I include his statement here and refer to it in the summary which follows the quotations from the grammars] earlier than that in which it would normally stand, especially by giving it the first place.

Hale: An emphatic word is often taken out of a dependent clause and put before the connective, especially if it belongs in thought to both the dependent and the main clause.

[I quote the examples because I refer to them later on in the paper.]

servi mehercule mei si me isto pacto metuerent,

domum meam relinquendam putarem; Cat. I, 7,

Caesari cum id nuntiatum esset, maturat ab
urbe proficisci; B. Q. I, 7, 1.

- a. Sometimes many words of the dependent clause precede the connective.

Harkness: When either the subject or the object is the same both in the Principal and in the Subordinate clause, it usually stands at or near the beginning of the sentence and is followed by the subordinate clause.

1. When the object of the principal clause is the same as the subject of the subordinate clause, it usually stands at the beginning of the sentence

Conjunctions and relatives may follow emphatic words In general, in negative clauses the negative word, whether particle, verb, or noun, is made prominent.

Kühner: Subordinate conjunctions (ut, cum, si, etc.) and pronouns (Relative and Interrogative) are regularly placed at the first of the subordinate clause; yet often - by an emphatic word or even by a "Komplex" - are deferred. The introductory word in every case precedes

the verb. (Except occasionally in the poets.)

A subject or object which is either common to an independent and a dependent clause or serves in one as Subject and in the other as Object is, when it is to be emphasized, placed at the beginning of the whole complex sentence.

Madvig: Relative words, which refer back to what precedes, can never (in prose) be dislodged from the first place. Relatives, on the contrary, which refer to a demonstrative proposition following, as well as interrogative pronouns, may stand after a very emphatic word. So, likewise, when a conjunctive subordinate proposition precedes the leading proposition, the conjunction may stand after one or several words which have a particular emphasis, frequently after pronouns, which refer to something preceding. In prose the verb is never put before the relative or the conjunction. Ut and ne, even where the leading proposition comes first, have sometimes one or several words before them: In particular a negative word often stands before ut, signifying so that (vix ut, nemo ut, nihil ut, nullus ut, also prope ut, paene ut)

A period is often formed in Latin, when the leading proposition is broken off, by placing first a word of the leading proposition which belongs at the same time to

the subordinate (e. g. as a common subject or object), and which points with emphasis to the person or thing to be mentioned and the subordinate proposition immediately after it.

Nutting, Advanced Latin Composition, p. 7, Ex. 4, footnote 4: When the same person or thing is referred to in both the main and the subordinate clause, this subject of discourse should be placed first, with the subordinate clause immediately following. This arrangement makes the subject of discourse a part of the main clause; e. g. Romani, cum venissent, castra posuerunt. The English usage is different, "When the Romans came, they pitched a camp."

Allen and Greenough, likewise with Nutting, do not consider that any part of the subordinate clause has been placed in front of the introductory word to that clause:

In the structure of the Period:

- a. In general the main subject or object is put in the main clause, not in a subordinate one:-

Hannibal cum recensuisset auxilia Gades profectus est (Liv. XXI. 21)

- d. A change of subject, when required, is marked by the introduction of a pronoun, if the new subject has already been mentioned. But such change is often purposely avoided by a change in the structure, - the less important being merged in the more important by the aid of participles and subordinate phrases:-

quem ut barbari incendium effugisse viderunt,
telis eminus missis interfecerunt (Nep. Alc.
 10.)

- e. So the repetition of a noun, or the substitution of a pronoun for it, is avoided unless a different case is required:-

dolorem si non potuero frangere occultabo (Phil.
 XII. 21.)

To sum up these statements made in the grammars: all state in some way or another that an element belonging in common to both the main and the subordinate clause is prone to be placed first in the sentence, followed immediately by the subordinate clause. (They disagree on the point: in which clause does this factor actually stand?) All except Hale limit their definitions of this "common factor" [for such I shall term it] to a common subject or object, or a subject of a main clause which is at

the same time the object, direct or indirect, of a subordinate clause or vice versa. Hale speaks of an element which "belongs in thought to both the dependent and the main clause." Harkness, Kühner, and Madvig also stress emphasis as a reason. Madvig is the only one to mention the possibility of reference back, through pronouns, to something preceding, or "linking" [as I shall term it] with what has gone before; that is, he is the only one to specifically mention the subordinate clause, though I have given Bennett's and Burton's statements about "clauses" in general.

These statements, which refer only to the beginning of a subordinate clause, are the only ones given in this connection in the grammars.

This part of my investigation has been confined to the following questions and answering conclusions: [I append to this summary a complete exposition of the evidence upon which I base these conclusions.]

1. Is there a tendency for subordinate clauses that stand at the beginning of the sentence to be irregular at the beginning of the clause?

Conclusion: There is a marked tendency, since

.463 of such clauses are irregular at the beginning of the clause.

2. Is there a tendency for subordinate clauses that stand at the end of the sentence to be irregular at the end of the clause?

Conclusion: There is a distinct tendency only in De Senectute (.282 of such clauses are irregular at the end in that work); though even in Caesar I. and II. and Catiline I. and II. this reason accounts for some of the irregularities. Further, main clauses that stand at the end of the sentence are much more frequently irregular at the end than are subordinate clauses occupying that position.

3. Is the importance given by the grammars to the common factor and to emphasis as reasons to account for the postponement of the introductory word of a subordinate clause warranted?

Conclusion: No; these reasons must rather yield the first place to the tendency to link together statements as they follow one after another. Further, certain kinds of emphasis stand out more than others (if the term "emphasis" be used in its broadest sense): prominence for a new subject of discourse, for

one of two rival factions or interests, for a new speaker, for a member of a series, and so on. The rule given by the grammars for the position of a common factor is disproved by the facts of usage gathered from the material covered in this treatment.

4. What part, if any, does the position of sum have in this discussion?

Conclusion: Out of the 215 (231) subordinate clauses which are irregular at the end 81 (83) have as their verb some form of sum or some verb form compounded with sum [21 out of 50 (51) in Caesar I. and II., 21 out of 42 (48) in Catiline I. and II., and 39 (41) out of 123 (132) in De Senectute].

By a comparison with the main clauses containing sum (regular and irregular) and with the subordinate clauses containing sum that are regular, it was found that while .427 of the subordinate clauses containing sum were irregular at the end (and .111 of those containing verbs compounded with sum), .744 of the main clauses containing sum (.20 of those containing verbs compounded with sum) were irregular. That is enough for the purposes of this paper. We cannot here go into the question of why sum acts as it does: enough that it acts less erratically

in the subordinate clauses than in the main clauses.

5. Is Cicero more influenced by the factor of avoiding certain rhythms at the end of a sentence than Caesar?

Conclusion : From my very limited investigation I can say only that Cicero seems to take this factor into account more than Caesar, and that to this cause may probably be attributed a number of the irregularities among the subordinate clauses that stand at the end of a sentence.

6. Other suggested reasons for irregularities at the end of a subordinate clause. (These reasons have not been tested out sufficiently to warrant any conclusions. An extensive reading in many authors rather than the intensive study of a limited portion of two authors such as I have made would be necessary in most instances before any conclusions could safely be drawn. In some instances the Lexicons would furnish the necessary facts. I have set down these tentative reasons, hoping they might suggest topics for further study.)

Exposition of the evidence upon which the
conclusions just given were based.

1. Is there a tendency for subordinate clauses that stand at the beginning of the sentence to be irregular at the beginning of the clause?

The statistics upon which I have based my conclusion are as follows:

Table IV. Subordinate Clauses that stand at
the First of the Sentence.

	[Total number of clauses irregular at the beginning of the clause]	Total number of clauses that stand at the first of the sentence	Number at the first of the sentence that are irregular at the beginning of the clause	Percentage of those at the first of the sentence that are irregular at the beginning of the clause
Caesar I. and II.	79 (89)	153	66	.431
Catiline I. and II.	37 (40)	77	36	.467
De Senecute	44 (46)	59	32	.542
	160(175)	289	134	.463

The surprisingly large percentages would seem to show that there is a very marked tendency for clauses that stand at the beginning of the sentence to be irregular at the beginning of the clause. I have placed within brackets the total number of subordinate clauses irregular at the beginning. I have done so that I might make a comparison at a later point in the paper.

2. Is there a tendency for subordinate clauses that stand at the end of the sentence to be irregular at the end of the clause?

I have given the statistics upon this question and compared them with corresponding statistics for main clauses in the following table:

Table V: All clauses that stand at the end of
the sentence.

Part I: Main Clauses (including simple sentences).

	Total number of main claus- es that stand at the end	Total number of simple sen- tences	Sum of the sim- ple sen- tences and the main clauses at the end	Main claus- es in which the verb does not stand at the end	Simple sen- tences in which the verb does not stand at the end	Total of main claus- es and simple sen- tences irre- gular at the end	Percent- age of main clauses and sim- ple sen- tences irregu- lar at the end
Caesar I. and II.	177	168	345	8	23	31	.089
Catiline I. and II.	92	162	254	21	56	77	.303
De Senec- tute	79	189	268	28	111	139	.518
Totals	348	519	867	57	190	247	.284

Table V: All clauses that stand at the end of
the sentence.

Part II: Subordinate Clauses.

	Total number at the end of sentence.	Number irregu- lar at the end of the clause.	Percentage of those irregular at the end.
Caesar I. and II.	187	7	.037
Catiline I. and II.	133(135)	6(8)	.045
<u>De Senectute</u>	191(194)	54(57)	.282
Totals	511(516)	67(72)	.131

Conclusions: Only .037 of the subordinate clauses at the close of the sentence are irregular at the end in Caesar I. and II., and only .045 in Catiline I. and II.; but .282 of such in De Senectute are irregular at the end. This undoubtedly accounts largely, then, for the fact^{that} .286 of all the subordinate clauses in De Senectute are irregular at the end (as contrasted with .061 in Caesar I. and II. and .101 in Catiline I. and II.).

In every case the percentage of main clauses (including simple sentences) that stand at the end of the sentence and are at the same time irregular at the end of the clause is much larger than the corresponding percentage among subordinate clauses.

3. To test out the grammar statements about the position of a common factor, - namely, that it stands first in the sentence, followed immediately by the subordinate clause, - I collected every instance in which one expressed element belonged at once to the subordinate and to the main clause: that is to say, an element expressed but once in Latin which would need to be repeated or its place supplied by some pronominal equivalent if an English translation were to be made. I have tabulated these instances in the next table.

At the same time I attempted to test out Hale's statement, interpreting it to mean that any element that "belongs in thought to both the dependent and the main clause" is to be placed before the introductory word of the dependent clause. Obviously I could undertake to count only those instances in which some person or thing was expressed in both clauses. Such a person or thing would clearly "belong in thought" to both clauses. There were 122 (126) such cases in the first 35 chapters of the first book of Caesar: instances, that is, in which an element belonging in thought to both clauses was not placed first, followed immediately by the subordinate clause, but was expressed in both clauses. It was needless to pursue this point further. I conclude, for my part, that Hale's second illustration, only (Caesari cum id nuntiatum esset, maturat ab urbe proficisci; B. G. I, 7, 1), is to be taken as containing an "emphatic word" that "belongs in thought to both the dependent and the main clause." Nevertheless I have included his first illustration (servi mehercule mei si me isto pacto metuerent, domum meam relinquentam putarem; Cat. I, 7, 17), though marked by a ?, among the following tabulated instances of a common factor.

... instances of a common factor.

Table VI: Position of the Common
Factor in Caesar I. and II.

Positions of the Common Factor [C.F.]:						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Function of the Common Factor in the Main [M] and in the Subordinate [S] clause	C.F. first, followed by Subor. clause, Main clause last	Subor. clause containing C.F. first, Main clause last	Subor. clause first, followed by Main clause containing C.F.	Main clause containing C.F. first, Subor. clause last	Main clause first, followed by Subor. clause containing C.F.	Total of 2,3,4, 5.
Subject of both	47(57)	14(16)	5	27(33)	1	47(55)
[Subject of both (Indirect Discourse)]	[13(16)]					
Subject of M, direct object of S						
Direct object of M, subject of S.		6	1(2)	8(14)		15(22)
Direct object of both	1	4		1		5
Indirect object of M, subject of S			3	27(33)		30(36)
Subject of M, indirect object of S	1					
Genitive in both						
Genitive in M, subject in S			1	1		2
Genitive in S, subject in M		1				1

Table VI: Position of the Common

Factor in Caesar I. and II. (*continued*)

Position of the Common Factor [C.F.] :						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Function of the Common Factor in the Main [M] and in the Subordinate [S] clause	C.F. first, followed by Subor. clause, Main clause last	Subor. clause containing C.F. first, Main clause last	Subor. clause first, followed by Main clause containing C.F.	Main clause containing C.F. first, Subor. clause last	Main clause first, followed by Subor. clause containing C.F.	Total of 2,3,4, 5.
Ablative Absolute in M, subject in S				1		1
Cum + Ablative in M, subject in S			2	1		3
Ex + Ablative in M, subject in S				3(7)		3(7)
A + Ablative in M, subject in S				2		2
A + Ablative in S, subject in M		1				1
Ad + Accusative in M, subject in S			1	1		2
Ad + Accusative in S, subject in M		1				1
In + Accusative in M, subject in S		1		2		3
Phrase in both	1					
Totals	51(61) [13(16)]	28(30)	13(14)	74(96)	1	116(141)

Table VI: Position of the Common
Factor in Catiline I. and II.

Position of the Common Factor [C. F.] :						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Function of the Common Factor in the Main [M] and in the Subordinate [S] clause	C.F. first, followed by Subor. clause, Main clause last	Subor. clause containing C.F. first, Main clause last	Subor. clause first, followed by Main clause containing C.F.	Main clause containing C.F. first, Subor. clause last	Main clause first, followed by Subor. clause containing C.F.	Total of 2,3,4, 5.
Subject of both	12(14)	4	1	4(5)	1	10(11)
Subject of M, direct object of S						
Direct object of M, subject of S		3		6(7)		9(10)
Direct object of both	3					
Indirect object of M, subject of S				3		3
Subject of M, indirect object of S	1					
Genitive in M, subject in S				1		1
? Adjective (mei) in S, subject in M ? 1						
Adverb phrase in both	2					
Adverb in both	2					
Totals	21(23)	7	1	14(16)	1	23(25)

Table VI: Position of the Common
Factor in De Senectute.

Positions of the Common Factor [C. F]:						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Function of the Common Factor in the Main [M] and in the Subordinate [S] clause	C.F.first, followed by Subor. clause, Main clause last	Subor. clause containing C.F. first, Main clause last	Subor. clause first, followed by Main clause containing C.F.	Main clause containing C.F. first, Subor. clause last	Main clause first, followed by Subor. clause containing C.F. (in 2 cases C. F. = between clauses)	Total of 2,3,4, 5.
Subject of both	14(15)	5	2	18(25)	2	27(34)
[Subject of both (Indirect Discourse)]	3					
Subject of M, direct object of S					1	1
Direct object of M, subject of S		3		8(10)	3	14(16)
Direct object of both	2	4(6)			1	5(7)
Indirect object of M, subject of S				5(9)		5(9)
Subject of M, indirect object of S						
Genitive in M, subject in S				1		1
Ablative with Deponent in M, subject in S			1			1

Table VI: Position of the Common
Factor in De Senectute.

Positions of the Common Factor [C. F.] :						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Function of the Common Factor in the Main [M] and in the Subordinate [S] clause	C.F.first, followed by Subor. clause, Main clause last	Subor. clause contain- ing C.F. first, Main clause last	Subor. clause first, follow- ed by Main clause contain- ing C.F.	Main clause contain- ing C.F. first, Subor. clause last	Main clause first, follow- ed by Subor. clause contain- ing C.F. (in 2 cases C. F. = be- tween clauses)	Total of 2,3,4, 5.
Ablative of Comparison in M, subject in S			1			1
A + Ablative in M, subject in S				1(2)		1(2)
In + Ablative in M, subject in S				1		1
? Adjective in Main, subject in S			?1			?1
Predicate Adjec- tive in both	2					
Phrase in both	1				2	2
Totals (De Senectute) [3]	19(20)	12(14)	4	35(49)	9	60(76)
Totals (Catiline I. and II.)	21(23)	7	1	14(16)	1	23(25)
Totals (Caesar I. and II.)	51(61)	28(30)	13(14)	74(96)	1	116(141)
	91(104) [16(19)]	47(51)	18(19)	123(161)	11	199(242)

Conclusions based on the table (VI): A comparison of the totals at the end of the table (Table VI.) shows:

(a) The order - common factor, subordinate clause, main clause - that is upheld by the grammars is not the usual one, since it is employed 107 (¹²³~~213~~) times and other orders are employed 199 (242) times. It is not even employed more times than any other single order, for the order in which the main clause containing the common factor is followed by the subordinate clause occurs almost twice as many times in Caesar I. and II., almost half again as many times in De Senectute, and reaches a total nearly as great as the order given by the grammars in Catiline I. and II.

(b) The grammars (all except Hale, and I have answered his statement) speak only of an element which is a common subject or object, or a subject of the main clause which is at the same time the object, direct or indirect, of the subordinate clause or vice versa. The long list of elements tabulated - a number of them occurring in Column 1 - show that in this second respect the grammar statements are misleading. On the other hand, the blank spaces opposite "Subject of the Main, direct object of the Subordinate" and "Subject of the Main, in-

direct object of the Subordinate" show the fallacy of any such statements. The most that can be said is that in Caesar I. and II. and in Catiline I. and II. (not however in De Senectute) one kind of a common element - that which serves as common subject - is more often found in the position set forth in the grammars than in any other one position tabulated. I shall try to show, however, that this element takes this position for reasons other than the mere fact of its being a common factor.

(c) Grammarians flatly disagree on the point: in which clause, main or subordinate, does the Common Factor actually stand and so primarily belong?

I have tacitly agreed with those who attribute the common factor to the main clause in that I have counted as irregular those subordinate clauses which follow immediately such a common factor. I personally am convinced, however, that this ^{subordinate} common factor should be counted as a part of the main clause except in the 6 (7) instances in which the case of the factor shows it must belong to the subordinate clause. I have come to this conclusion because of the following facts which I quote for what they are worth:

(1) There are 16 (19) instances of a subordinate clause following immediately a se, the subject of

an Infinitive in Indirect Discourse, the subject of which clause must be supplied from the se.

(2) In Columns 2, 3, 4 and 5 in Table VI., the common factor is found in the subordinate clause 56 (60) times, but in the main clause 141 (180) times.

It would appear, then, that we must look about for some other explanation of these 91 (104) examples other than the fact that they are factors common to both the main and the subordinate clauses. Disregarding my own conviction that 85 (94) of them should not properly be considered irregular (as I am using that term in this paper) I shall still take them up as if they were irregular and attempt to explain the position of the common factor as due to reasons other than the mere fact of its being a common factor. Before taking up these 91 (104) examples, however, I wish to examine the remaining 69 (71) clauses [out of the total 160 (175) clauses that are irregular at the beginning of the clause]. It has seemed to me that in 48 (50) out of these 69 (71) clauses the word or words placed in front of the introductory word of the subordinate clause are placed there to form a connecting link with what has preceded. I have given these examples first, calling them examples of "Linking."

INSTANCES OF LINKING IN

Caesar I. and II: (The word that performs the linking is underscored).

I, 9, 2: Relinquebatur una per Sequanos via, qua Sequanis invitis propter angustias ire non poterant.

His cum sponte persuadere non possent

I, 10, 2: Caesari nuntiatur Helvetiis esse in animo per agrum Sequanorum et Haeduorum iter in Santonum fines facere Id si fieret

I, 28, 1: . . . circiter hominum milia VI eius pagi . . . ad Rhenum finesque Germanorum contenderunt. ¶28.

Quod ubi Caesar rescit

I, 31, 4: . . . harum alterius principatum tenere Haeduos, alterius Arvernos. Hi cum tantopere de potentatu inter se multos annos contenderent

I, 31,15: . . . Haec si enuntiata. Ariovisto sint, non dubitare, quin supplicium sumat.

I, 32, 2: . . . Sequanos . . . tristes capite demisso terram intueri. Eius rei quae causa esset

I, 38, 2: . . . nuntiatum est ei Ariovistum cum suis copiis ad occupandum Vesontionem . . . contendere. Id ne accideret

I, 40, 1: Nonnulli etiano Caesari nuntiabant, cum castra moveri ac signa ferri iussisset, non fore dicto audientes milites neque propter timorem signa

laturus. ¶40. Haec cum animadvertisset

I, 42, 6: . . . commodissimum esse statuit omnibus equis
Gallis equitibus detractis eo legionarios milites
legionis X. imponere . . . Quod cum fieret

I, 44, 11: Debere se suspicari simulata Caesarem amicitia,
quem exercitum in Gallia habeat, sui opprimendi
causa habere. Qui nisi decedat

I, 47, 6: His mandavit, ut, quae diceret Ariovistus, cog-
noscerent et ad se referrent. Quos cum apud se
in castris Ariovistus conspexisset

I, 52, 7: . . . a dextro vehementer . . . nostram aciem
premebant. Id cum animadvertisset P. Crassus
adulescens

I, 54, 1: Suebi . . . domum reverti coeperunt; quos ubi,
qui proximi Rhenum incolunt, perterritos senserunt

II, 3, 1: . . . ad fines Belgarum pervenit. ¶3. Eo cum de
improviso celeriusque omnium opinione venisset,

II, 9, 1: Palus erat non magna inter nostrum atque hostium
exercitum. Hanc si nostri transirent

II, 13, 2: . . . exercitumque in Bellovacos ducit. Qui cum
se suaque omnia in oppidum Bratuspantium contul-
issent

II, 14, 6: Petere . . . ut sua clementia ac mansuetudine
in eos utatur. Quod si fecerit

II, 17, 5: . . . Nervii . . . effecerant, ut instar muri
hae saepes munimentum praeberent, quo non modo
non intrari, sed ne perspici quidem posset.

His rebus cum iter agminis nostri impediretur

II, 29, 3: . . . sua omnia in unum oppidum egregie natura
munitum contulerunt. Quod cum ex omnibus in
circuitu partibus altissimas rupes delectusque
haberet

Catiline I. and II.:

I, 5: Si te iam, Catilina, comprehendi, si interfici
iussero, credo, erit verendum mihi ne non potius
hoc omnes boni serius a me, quam quisquam crude-
lius factum esse dicat. Verum ego hoc, quod iam
pridem factum esse oportuit, certa de causa non-
dum adducor ut faciam.

II, 5: Hos, quos video volitare in Foro, quos,
mallem secum suos milites eduxisset; qui si
hic permanent, mementote

II, 10: Atque idem tamen, stuprorum et scelerum exer-
citatione adsuefactus frigore et fame et
siti et vigiliis perferundis, fortis ab istis
praedicabatur . . . #10. Hunc vero si secuti
erunt sui comites

- II, 11: Quibus ego confido impendere fatum aliquod et poenam appropinquare. Quos si meus consulatus sustulerit
- II, 12: At etiam sunt qui dicant, Quirites, a me in exsilium eiectum esse Catilinam. Quod ego si verbo adsequi possem
- II, 18: Neque enim isti, qui possessiones habent, alia ratione ulla salvi esse possunt. Quod si maturius facere voluissent
- II, 23: Hi pueri tam lepidi . . . non solum amare et amari . . . sed etiam sicas vibrare et spargere venena didicerunt. Qui nisi exeunt, nisi pereunt, scitote

The clause Quae cum ita sint occurs three times:

I, 10; I, 20; II, 26. The linking is so obvious that the context need not be given.

De Senectute:

- 3: . . . eisque eum respondentem. Qui si eruditius videbitur disputare quam consuevit ipse
- 4: . . . in primis senectus, quam ut adipiscantur omnes optant
- 12: Est in manibus laudatio, quam cum legimus
- 15: Etenim . . . quattuor reperio causus cur senectus misera videatur; unam, . . . ; alteram, . . . Earum, si placet, causarum quanta quamque

sit iusta una quaeque videamus.

- 19: Nec enim excursione nec . . . uteretur, sed consilio, ratione, sententia. Quae nisi essent in senibus
- 26: Quid, qui etiam addiscunt aliquid? ut et Solonem Quod cum fecisse Socratem in fidibus audirem
- 31: Et tamen dux ille Graeciae nusquam optat ut Aiacis similis habeat decem, sed ut Nestoris, quod si sibi acciderit,
- 35: Quam fuit imbecillus P. Africani filius, is qui te adoptavit! quam tenui aut nulla potius valetudine! Quod ni ita fuisset
- 38: . . sic senem in quo est aliquid adolescentis probo; quod qui sequitur, corpore senex esse poterit, animo numquam erit.
- 38: . . . easque tueor animi non corporis viribus. Quas si exsequi nequirem, tamen me lectulus meus oblectaret
- 41: . . . neque omnino in voluptatis regno virtutem posse consistere. Quod quo magis intellegi posset, fingere animo
- 51: . . . culmoque erecta geniculato vaginis iam quasi pubescens includitur; equibus cum emersit

- 64: . . . consurrexisse omnes illi dicuntur, et senem sessum recepisse. ¶64. Quibus cum a cuncto consessu plausus esset multiplex datus
- 64: Quae sunt igitur voluptates corporis cum auctoritatis praemiis comparandae? quibus qui splendide usi sunt
- 67: Itaque pauci veniunt ad senectutem. Quod ni ita accideret
- 67: Meus enim et ratio et consilium in senibus est, qui si nulli fuissent
- 76: Ergo, ut superiorum aetatum studia occidunt, sic occidunt etiam senectutis. Quod cum evenit
- 78: . . . non posse eum [animus] dividi; quod si non possit
- 82: Sed nescio quo modo animus erigens se posteritatem ita semper prospiciebat, quasi cum excessisset e vita tum denique victurus esset. Quod quidem ni ita se haberet

So few out of the 69 (71) remain (but 21 in all)

that it seems best to take them up one by one by authors:

Caesar I. and II:

In the five clauses following the word or words placed before the introductory word seem to be clearly emphatic:

I, 6, 1: unum per Sequanos, angustum et difficile, . . .
vix qua singuli carri ducerentur.

I,25, 4: Gallis magno ad pugnam erat impedimento, quod .
 . . . multi ut diu iactato brachio praeopta-
 rent scutum manu emittere et nudo corpore pugnare

I,26, 1: Diutius cum sustinere nostrorum impetus non pos-
 sent

I,26, 4: Diu cum esset pugnatum

I,43, 3: Ariovistus, ex equis ut colloquerentur et praeter
 se denos ad colloquium adducerent, postulavit.

In II, 5, 5: "Quae res et latus unum castrorum
 ripis fluminis muniebat et, post eum quae erant, tuta ab
 hostibus reddebat" . . . , the words post eum seem to be con-
 trasted with latus unum; and these with the clause immed-
 iately following "reddebat et, commeatus ab Remis reliquis-
que civitatibus ut sine periculo ad eum supportari possent,
 efficiebat" make up a series of objects in view. Another
 series: I, 46, 4: Posteaquam in vulgus militum elatum est,
 qua arrogantia in colloquio Ariovistus usus omni Gallia Roman-
 is interdixisset, impetumque in nostros eius equites fec-
 isse eaeque res colloquium ut diremisset [also linking].

In I, 12 Caesar tells us of the engagement with
 the Tigurini, one pagus of the Helvetii. He opens chapter
 13: "Hoc proelio facto reliquas copias Helvetiorum ut con-
 sequi posset." The contrast is clear. This might be con-

sidered to be a case of linking as well.

Not to seem to press these reasons too far I simply quote the one remaining irregular clause:

I, 9, 4: Itaque rem suscipit et a Sequanis impetrat, ut per fines suos Helvetios ire patiantur, obsidesque uti inter sese dent perficit:

Catiline I. and II:

The six clauses that have not been classed as instances of linking are all found in Catiline I., and are all of exactly the same kind, four occurring in succession, a fifth in the same chapter, and the sixth in the next chapter but one:

I, 22: Te ut ulla res frangat? Tu ut umquam te corrigas? Tu ut ullam fugam meditare? Tu ut ullum exsilium cogites? Sed tu ut vitiis tuis commovere.

I, 24: Tu ut illa carere diutius possis

The emphasis cannot be questioned in these clauses.

De Senectute:

A negative climax seems to be reached in the following irregularity:

65: Severitatem in senectute probo, sed eam (sicut alia) modicam; acerbitatem nullo modo. Avàritia vero senilis quid sibi velit non intellego.

In 11: Nec vero in armis praestantior quam in toga, qui consul iterum, . . . restitit agrum Picentem et Gallicum augurque cum esset
Augur seems to be contrasted with consul just before.

A new element in the discussion of the lack of bodily vigor in old age is so introduced at the beginning of

28: Orator metuo ne languescat senectute

It seems just to attribute to emphasis the following:

4: Deinde, qui minus gravis esset eis senectus, si octingentesimum annum agerent quam si octogesimum? Praeterita enim aetas quamvis longa cum effluxisset, nulla consolatio permulcere posset stultam senectutem.

I simply quote the two instances that remain:

34: Audire te arbitror, Scipio, hospes tuus avitus Masinissa quae faciat hodie nonaginta natur annos;

74: . . post mortem quidem sensus aut optandus aut nullus est. Sed hoc meditatam ab adolescentia debet esse mortem ut neglegamus

I am now ready to set down the examples of subordinate clauses in which some element of the clause - any part of speech whatsoever - is common to it and to the main

clause and so has been placed before the introductory word (or, in rare instances, in which instances the clauses are counted as irregular at the end, following the verb of the subordinate clause) and to give explanations other than that of "Common Factor" where I can.

In but 3 instances out of 51(61) in Books I. and II. of Caesar the case of the common element shows that it can belong syntactically only to the subordinate clause:

I, 7, 1: Caesari cum id numtium esset, eos per provinciam nostram iter facere conari, maturat ab urbe proficisci

I, 14, 2: qui si alicuius iniuriae sibi conscius fuisset, non fuisse difficile cavere;

I, 26, 6: qui, si iuvissent, se eodem loco, quo Helvetios, habiturum.

In the first example of the three the word Caesari opens a new chapter. The preceding chapter has concluded an account of the plans of the Helvetii. We now know at once at the word Caesari that we are to learn about the second of the two contending forces. The second and third examples are quite obviously^{so} written as to link up closely with the antecedents which precede.

In the remaining 48(58) clauses the element may belong syntactically either to the subordinate clause or

to the main clause. I have considered the question as to which clause it does actually belong ; at present I am concerned with possible explanations for the position of these elements other than the fact that they are common factors. The distinctions between the various possible explanations cannot be made with too dogmatic insistence. Caesar did not label one word as a connecting link between two ideas, and another as the mark of introduction for a new speaker or a new turn in events. Neither, then, can we draw too sharp distinctions. But the attempt to distinguish the reasons serves the purpose of reminding us that all these reasons and explanations probably exist:

The following 11 (14) clauses seem to me to illustrate linking as clearly as the other clauses I have given under that head:

I, 11, 2: Helvetii iam . . . in Haeduorum fines pervenerant

. . . Haedui cum se suaque ab iis defendere non possent, legatos ad Caesarem mittunt rogatum auxilium:

I, 12, 5: Is pagus appellabatur Tigurinus; . . . Hic pagus unus, cum domo exisset, patrum nostrorum memoria L. Cassium consulem interfecerat

I, 27, 2: Helvetii . . . legatos dededitione ad eum miserunt. Qui cum eum in itinere convenissent seque ad pedes

proiecissent suppliciterque locuti flentes
pacem petissent atque eos in eo loco, quo
tum essent, suum adventum expectare iussis-
set, paruerunt.

- I, 52, 2: Caesar singulis legionibus singulos legatos
et quaestorem praefecit; ipse
a dextro cornu, quod eam partem minime firmam
hostium esse animadverterat, proelium commisit.
- II, 15, 3: Eorum fines Nervii attingebant. Quorum de natura
moribusque Caesar cum quaereret, sic reperiebat:
[Caesar too, is emphasized.]
- II, 26, 5: X. legionem subsidio nostris misit. Qui cum ex
equitum et calonum fuga, quo in loco res
versaretur, cognovissent, nihil ad celeritatem
sibi reliqui fecerunt.
- II, 29, 5: Ipsi erant ex Cimbris Teutonisque prognati, qui
. . . . VI. milia hominum reliquerant.
Hi post eorum obitum multos annos a finitimis
exagitati, cum alias bellum inferrent, alias
illatum defenderent, consensu eorum omnium pace
facta hunc sibi domicilio locum delegerant.
- II, 33, 2: Sub vesperum Caesar portas claudi militesque
ex oppido exire iussit, ne quam noctu oppidani
a militibus iniuriam acciperent. Illi ante

inito . . . consilio, quod deditioe facta
 nostros praesidia deducturos credid-
 erant, partim cum iis, quae retinuerant et
 celaverant, armis, partim scutis ex cortice
 factis, quae subito pellibus
 induxerant, eruptionem fecerunt.

II,35, 3: Quas legationes Caesar ad se reverti
 iussit.

Ipse in Carnutes quaeque civitates
 propinquae iis locis erant, ubi bellum ges-
 serat, legionibus in hiberna deductis in
 Italiam profectus est;

In the following examples a new subject or new
 element in the narrative is placed first:

I, 27, 4: Dum ea conquiruntur et conferuntur, circiter
hominum milia VI. eius pagi, qui, sive
 timore perterriti, ne armis traditis supplicio
 afficerentur, sive spe salutis inducti, quod
 in tanta multitudine dediticiorum suam fugam
 aut occultari aut omnino ignorari posse existi-
 marent, prima nocte e castris Helvetiorum egressi
 ad Rhenum finesque Germanorum contenderunt.

II,23, 1: Legionis VIII. et X. milites, ut in sinistra
 parte aciei constiterant, . . . Atrebates . .
 . . compulerunt et

II, 24, 4: Quibus omnibus rebus permoti equites
Treveri, quorum . qui . , cum multitudine
 hostium castra compleri vidissent,
 domum contenderunt:

In the next chapter then the narrative goes
 on,

II, 25, 1-2: Caesar ab X. legionis cohortatione ad dextrum
 cornu profectus, ubi suos urgeri
 vidit , quartae cohortis omnibus centu-
 rionibus occisis vidit , in primam
 aciem processit

After telling of the checking of the enemy,

II, 26, 1: Caesar, cum VII. legionem item urgeri
 ab hoste vidisset, tribunos militum monuit

II, 28, 1-2: Hoc proelio facto maiores natu . . .
 hac pugna nuntiata cum victoribus nihil impedi-
 tum, victis nihil tutum arbitrarentur, . . .
 legatos ad Caesarem miserunt

II, 29, 1: Atuatuci, de quibus supra diximus, cum omnibus
 copiis auxilio Nervii venirent, hac pugna nun-
 tiata ex itinere domum reverterunt

There are, of course, throughout the books of
 Caesar two factions: Caesar on the one side, the particular
 enemy he is fighting on the other. Caesar tells of one side
 then of the other and warns us of the change by bringing the

new subject in at once. The instances of this particular type of new subject are numerous [15 (17) in all]:

(When a verb is given in the singular, third person and no subject is quoted, Caesar is to be understood as the subject.)

I, 7, 4: Ubi de eius adventu Helvetii certiores facti sunt, legatos ad eum mittunt [and a description of the ambassadors and their request follows. Then:]

- Caesar, quod memoria tenebat L. Cassium consulem occisum exercitumque eius ab Helvetiis pulsum et sub ingum missum, concedendum non putabat;

I, 8, 4: Ubi ea dies . . . venit, negat se more et exemplo populi Romani posse iter ulli per provinciam dare et prohibiturum ostendit.

Helvetii ea spe delecti navibus iunctis

si perrumpere possent, repulsi hoc conatu destiterunt.

I, 13, 2: Hoc proelio facto pontem in Arari faciendum curat atque ita exercitum traducit. Helvetii repente eius adventu commoti, cum id illum uno die fecisse intellegerent, legatos ad eum mittunt;

I, 15, 3: et pauci de nostris cadunt. Quo proelio sublatis Helvetii, quod quingentis equitibus tantam

multitudinem equitum propulerant, audacius subsistere coeperunt. Caesar . . .

I,23, 3: ac Bibracte ire contendit.

Ea res per fugitivos . . . hostibus nuntiatur. Helvetii, seu quod timore perterritos Romanos discedere a se existimarent, sive eo, quod re frumentaria intercludi posse confiderent, commutato consilio . . . nostros . . . lacessere coeperunt.

I,42, 5: . . . Ariovistus postulavit, ne quem peditem ad colloquium Caesar adduceret: vereri se Caesar, quod neque colloquium interposita causa tolli volebat neque salutem suam Gallorum equitui committere audebat, commodissimum esse statuit.

I,43, 2: Eo, ut erat dictum, ad colloquium venerunt. Legionem Caesar, quam equis devexerat, passibus C C ab eo tumultu constituit. Item equites Ariovisti pari intervallo constiterunt.

I,49, 4: Eo circiter hominum XVI. milia expedita cum omni equitatu Ariovistus misit, quae copiae nostros terrerent et munitione prohiberent. Nihilo setius Caesar, ut ante constituerat, duas acies hostem propulsare, tertiam opus perficere iussit.

II,9, 1: Hanc si nostri transirent, hostes exspectabant; nostri autem, si ab illis initium transeundi fieret,

ut impeditos aggredierentur, parati in armis erant.

II, 10, 4: Hostes impeditos nostri . . . occiderunt . .

Hostes, ubi . . . spem se fefellisse intellexerunt neque nostros in locum iniquiorem progredi . . . viderunt . . . , constituerunt optimum esse domum suam quemque reverti . . . ut potius in suis quam in alienis finibus decertarent et domesticis copiis rei frumentariae uterentur.

[Then the departure of the enemy (all the Belgae) is described. The next paragraph of the chapter opens:]

II, 11, 2: Hac re statim Caesar per speculatores cognita insidias veritus, quod, qua de causa discederent, nondum perspexerat, exercitum equitatumque castris continuit.

II, 28, 3: . . . maiores natu ad Caesarem miserunt seque ei dediderunt Quos Caesar, ut in miseros ac supplices usus misericordia videretur, diligentissime conservavit

II, 35, 2: His rebus gestis omni Gallia pacata legationes ad Caesarem mitterentur Quas legationes Caesar, quod in Italiam Illyricumque properabat, inita proxima aestate ad se reverti iussit.

Many times attention is called to the several members of a series by placing each new member first in its sentence:

I, 26, 1: alteri se, ut coeperant, in montem receperunt

After the disposition of the other tribes
has been given:

I, 28, 5: Boios petentibus Haeduis, quod , ut in
finibus suis collocarent, concessit

I, 39, 3: nonnulli pudore adducti, ut timoris suspicion-
em vitarent, remanebant

After speaking of various German fugitives who
had been captured, Caesar speaks of another found among
the captives (this is also a new subject as well as here
one of a series):

I, 53, 5: C. Valerius Procillus, cum a custodibus in fuga
trinis catenis vinctus traheretur, in ipsum
Caesarem hostes equitatu insequentem incidit.

II, 1, 3: partim qui, ut Germanos diutius in Gallia ver-
sari noluerant, ita populi Romani exercitum
hiemare moleste ferebant

II, 11, 5: Cum ab extremo agmine impetum nostrorum
militum sustinerent, priores, quod abesse a peri-
culo viderentur neque ulla necessitate neque

imperio containerentur, exaudito clamore perturbatis ordinibus omnes in fuga sibi praesidium ponebant.

II,24, 1: Eodem tempore equites nostri levisque armaturae pedites cum se in castra reciperent, adversis hostibus occurrebant et calones cum respexissent et hostes in nostris castris versari vidissent, praecipites fugae sese mandabant.

II,27, 2: Horum adventu tanta rerum commutatio est facta, ut nostri, etiam qui vulneribus confecti proelium redintegrarent, calones perterritos inermes armatis occurrerent, equites vero, ut turpitudinem fugae virtute delerent, omnibus in locis pugnandi studio se legionariis militibus praeferrent.

In the following example the speaker who is about to speak is made prominent. The preceding paragraph has been taken up with a description of the speaker, and the narrative is resumed with the words:

I, 17, 1: Tum demum Liscus oratione Caesaris adductus, quod antea tacuerat, proponit:

In the next sentence the time and the place are made emphatic:

II, 2, 1: . . . Caesar duas legiones in citeriore Gallia novas conscripsit et, inita aestate in ulteriorem Galliam qui deduceret, Q. Pedium legatum misit.

The four clauses which follow are subordinate clauses which depend in turn upon subordinate clauses. They do not stand at the first of the sentence and I have not attempted an explanation. I feel the question is here more that of the arrangement of the clauses within a period:

II, 8, 4: ne . . . hostes, quod tantum multitudine poterant . . . circumvenire possent.

II,17, 4: quod Nervii antiquitus, cum equitatu nihil possent - . . . - quo facilius finitimorum equitatum . . . impedirent, . . . effecerant

II,29, 4: Ipse erant ex Cimbris Teutonisque prognati, qui, cum iter in provinciam nostram atque Italiam facerent, . . . VI. milia hominum una reliquerant.

The following example is unique in these two Books in that though the common subject follows the verb of the subordinate clause and so would seem to be classed with those sentences in which the main clause, containing the

common element, follows the subordinate clause, yet at the same time a second dependent clause which depends directly upon the first follows this element immediately; consequently I have called the first clause irregular at the close:

I,50, 4: Cum ex captivis quaereret Cassar,quam ob rem
Ariovistus proelio non decertaret, hanc reper-
iebat causam.

Catiline I. and II.

There are 3 (4) instances in which the common factor must, as is shown by its case, belong to the subordinate clause:

Catil.I,17: Servi mehercule mei si me isto pacto metuerent,
ut te metuunt omnes cives tui, domum meam relin-
quendam putarem

Catil.II,5: quibus ego non modo si aciem exercitus nostri,
verum etiam si edictum praetoris ostendero, con-
cident.

Catil.II,12: Quo cum Catilina venisset, quis eum senator
appellavit?

I have spoken of the first example and shown that I do not believe the words servi mehercule mei stand first

because they are common in thought to both clauses, but only because they are emphatic. The other examples clearly illustrate linking.

Of the remaining 18 (19) examples, the following 8 are also instances of linking:

Catil.I, 6: et viues ita ut viuis, multis meis et firmis praesidiis obsessus, ne commovere te contra rem publicam possis. Multorum te etiam oculi et aures non sentientem, sicut adhuc fecerunt, speculabuntur atque custodient.

Catil.I,19: Quae tecum, Catilina, sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur: ' . . . [. . a whole paragraph] . . . '

¶19: Haec si tecum, ita ut dixi, patria loquatur, nonne impetrare debeat

Catil.II,11:Quos si meus consulatus, quoniam sanare non potest, sustulerit

Catil.II,20:Hi dum aedificant tamquam beati, dum praediis lectis delectantur, in tantum aes alienum inciderunt

Catil.II,21:Qui homines quam primum, si stare non possunt, conruant

Catil.II,25:Ex hac enim parte pudor pugnat, illinc petulantia; hinc pudicitia . . . [and so on for a long paragraph]. In eius modi certamine ac proelio

nonne, si hominum studia deficient, di ipsi
 immortales cogant ab his praeclarissimis virtu-
 tibus tot et tanta vitia superari?

Catil.II,29:qui iam non procul, ut quondam solebant, ab ex-
 terno hoste atque longinquo, sed hic praesentes
 suo numine atque auxilio sua templa atque urbis
 tecta defendunt

In Catil.
 II, 27:

Mea lenitas adhuc, si cui solutior visa est,
 hoc expectavit

the term lenitas seems to sum up in a sin-
 gle word the course of action Cicero has taken
 and has just been describing.

Contrast and the juxtaposition of two rival
 elements are quite evident in the following:

Catil.I,17: Et, si me meis civibus iniuria suspectum tam
 graviter atque offensum viderem, carere me as-
 pectu civium quam infestis omnium oculis con-
 spici mallet. Tu, cum conscientia scelerum
 tuorum agnoscas odium omnium ~~im~~ustum et iam
 diu tibi debitum, dubitas, quorum mentis sensus-
 que volneras, eorum aspectum praesentiamque
 vitare?

Catil.II,16:Ille autem, si mehercule hoc quod agit
 numquam antea cogitasset, tamen latrocinantem

se interfici mallet quam exsulem vivere.

In Catil.

I, 29: His ego sanctissimis rei publicae vocibus,
 pauca respondebo. Ego, si hoc optimum factu
 iudicarem, patres conscripti, Catilinam morte
 multari, unius usuram horae gladiatori isti
 ad vivendum non dedissem. -

Cicero makes very definite the fact that he is
 beginning his response.

Another special form of contrast is the illus-
 tration:

Catil.I,31: Ut saepe homines aegri morbo gravi, cum aestu
 febrique iactantur, si aquam gelidam biberunt,
 primo relevari videntur, deinde multo gravius
 vehementiusque adfluctantur.

I would say that the elements placed first in
 the following are so placed with some thought of emphasis:

Catil.I,14: Nuper cum morte superioris uxoris novis nuptiis
 domum ^cvauefecisses, nonne etiam alio incredibili
 scelere hoc scelus cumulasti?

Catil.I,21: De te autem, Catilina, cum quiescunt, probant;
 cum patiuntur, decernunt; [and so on]. . .

Catil.II,12:Hesterno die, Quirites, cum domi meae paene
interfectus essem, senatum in aedem Iovis Stator-
is convocavi

Again I do not try to explain the one example
that remains, believing the explanation must be sought in
the structure of the period:

Catil.II,19:Non vident id se cupere, quod si adepti sint,
fugitivo alicui aut gladiatori concedi sit necesse?

De Senectute: There are 19 (20) instances of a common factor,
no one of which must, by its case, belong only to the sub-
ordinate clause: 7 seem to link up with what has preceded:

22: Sophocles ad summam senectutem tragoedias fecit;
quod propter studium cum rem negligere familiar-
em videretur, a filiis in iudicium vocatus est

28: . . . mitis oratio. Quam si ipse exsequi ne-
queas, possis tamen Scipioni praecipere et
Laelio.

41: . . nihil esse tam detestabile tamque pestiferum
quam voluptatem; si quidem ea, cum maior esset
atque longior, omne animi lumen exstingueret.

42: Ille enim, cum esset consul, in Gallia exoratus
. . . est

51: . . . ipsius terrae vis ac natura delectat.

Quae cum gremio mollito ac subacto sparsum
semen excepit, primum id occaecatum cohibet

52: Vitis quidem [one of a series of objects in-
spiring delighted interest], quae natura caduca
est, et nisi fulta est fertur ad terram, eadem
ut se erigat claviculis suis quasi manibus quic-
quid est nacta complectitur;

Contrast [6 (7) instances] is almost as common:

8: 'Nec (hercule),' inquit 'si ego Seriphius essem,
nec tu, si Atheniensis, clarus umquam fuisses.'

[counted with a ? because the verb is not express-
ed.]

48: Quod si istis ipsis voluptatibus bona aetas
fruitur libentius, primum parvulis fruitur re-
bus, ut diximus; deinde eis quibus senectus,
etiam si non abunde potitur, non omnino caret.

71: et quasi poma ex arboribus, cruda si sunt, vix
evelluntur, si matura et cocta, decidunt

72: Ut navem, ut aedificium idem destruit facillime
2ui construxit, sic hominem eadem optime quae

conglutinavit natura dissolvit. [Illustration.]

78: magnoque esse argumento homines scire pleraque ante quam nati sint, quod iam pueri, cum artis difficilis discant, ita celeriter res innumerabilis arripiant

80: abeunt enim illuc omnia unde orta sunt, animus autem solus nec cum adest nec cum discedit apparet.

Five (5) represent members of a series:

15: Ceteri senes, Fabricii, Curii, Coruncanii, cum rem publicam consilio et auctoritate defendebant, nihil agebant ?

30: Cyrus quidem apud Xenophontem eo sermone quem moriens habuit, cum admodum senex esset, negat se . . .

[Perhaps more an illustration than a part of a series:]

55: Possum persequi permulta oblectamenta rerum rusticarum Ergo in hac vita M'. Curius, cum de Samnitibus, ~~de Samnitibus~~, de Sabinis, de Pyrrho triumphavisset, consumpsit extremum tempus aetatis. Cuius quidem ego villam contemplan . . . Curio ad focum sedenti magnum auri pondus Samnites cum attulissent, repudiati sunt

[The first words, Curio ad focum sedenti
magnum auri pondus, belong to the subordinate clause and
 connect it with what has gone before.]

In the last example,

63: cum autem ad Lacedaemonios accessisset, qui,
legati cum essent, certo in loco consederant,
 the legati may be taken as belonging to both
 clauses, perhaps for emphasis. Perhaps the study of the
 structure of a period would throw light on the arrangement
 of the clauses.

Conclusions: There is for practically every
 common factor that stands before a subordinate clause some
 quite obvious reason why it should be there aside from the
 fact that it is a common factor. Of these reasons that of
 linking is most prominent, for 30 (34) out of the so-called
 common factors and 78 (84) out of the total number, 160
 (175), of clauses that are irregular at the beginning of
 the clause present instances of this. It is not exact to

* There has been lately in the periodicals a great deal
 of discussion about the influence upon the order of words of
 the logical relations of the concepts which they represent.

I have read, for example, these articles which touch upon some phase of this matter:

John Greene, Emphasis in Latin Prose, School Review, Vol. XV., p. 643;

Clarence L. Meader, On the Order of Words in Latin Prose, School Review, Vol. XVII., p. 230.

Some Recent Changes in Point of View in the Study and Teaching of the Ancient Languages, School Review, Vol. XV., pp. 754 ff.

Notes on the Order of Words in Latin, Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Vol. XXXIV., pp. XXXI. f.

In the last-named article or paper Mr. Meader quotes Wundt's definition of a sentence, Völkerpsychologie, I, 2, p. 240: "Der Satz ist der sprachliche Ausdruck für die willkürliche Gliederung einer Gesamtvorstellung in seine in logische Beziehungen zu einander gesetzten Bestandtheile," and adds, "i. e. the order of words in a sentence will be determined by the logical relations of the concepts they represent, to which relations the succession of the concepts in apperception will normally correspond. (This view is foreshadowed by H. Weil, 'L'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes, passim')."

I wish at this point, too, to make the comparison I spoke of in connection with Table IV:

There it is shown that out of the total number, 160 (175), of subordinate clauses that are irregular at the beginning of the clause, 134 stand at the beginning of a sentence. Does not this fact, taken with the examples of linking, point to a very evident desire to connect the separate sentences and paragraphs in the discourse?

class the majority of the remainder as irregular because certain words are emphasized; rather these should be differentiated to take into account (1) the large number in which a new subject or new speaker is introduced for the first time; closely associated with this latter (2) the large number in which one or the other of two rival factions or interests is introduced [15 (17) in Caesar I. and II. alone]; (3) those in which the members of a series are contrasted and compared; and so on.

4. What part, if any, does the question of the position of sum have in this discussion?

I have collected the facts about the position occupied by sum both in main and in subordinate clauses. (Here again the simple sentences are included among the main clauses.) I have collected similar facts for the position of sum when it forms a part of a compounded verb form. I have considered regular the comparatively small number of clauses (main and subordinate alike) in which but one of the elements of the compound verb form stood at the end of the clause or in which the elements stood in a transposed order. For my purpose such clauses are regular, for the clause is not complete until the full verb has been given. (The terms "regular" and "irregular" are used to denote clauses in which the verb closes the clause or does not close the clause.)

Table VII: The Position of Sum in Main and in Subordinate Clauses.

Part I.: Position of Sum

	Main Clauses			Subordinate Clauses		
	Total number of clauses	Irre- gular claus- es	Percent- age of clauses that are irregu- lar	Total number of claus- es	Irre- gular claus- es	Percent- age of clauses that are irregu- lar
Caesar I. and II.	28	26	.928	48(50)	18	.375
Catiline I. and II.	33	26	.787	29	19	.655
<u>De Senectute</u>	88	59	.670	82(86)	31(33)	.378
Totals	149	111	.744	159(165)	68(70)	.427

Table VII: The Position of Sum in Main and in Subordinate Clauses.

Part II: Position of verbs compounded
with Sum

	Main Clauses			Subordinate Clauses		
	Total	Irre- gular	Percent- age of Irregu- lar	Total	Irre- gular	Percent- age of Irregu- lar
Caesar I. and II.	47(48)	8	.170	46(51)	3	.065
Catiline I. and II.	36(40)	12	.333	26(27)	2	.076
De Senec- tute	31	3	.096	45(47)	8	.177
Totals	114(119)	23	.201	117(125)	13	.111

Conclusion: It is outside the scope of this paper to determine why sum acts as it does. It is enough for the purpose of this discussion to find that sum is more often and regularly found to stand last in subordinate clauses than in ~~the~~ main clauses.

5. Is Cicero more influenced by the factor of avoiding certain rhythms at the end of a sentence than Caesar?

The grammar statements about rhythm as a factor in prose writing are:

Allen and Greenough: The Romans were careful to close a period with an agreeable succession of long and short syllables:-

Note. - In rhetorical writing, particularly in oratory, the Romans, influenced by their study of the Greek orators, gave more attention to this matter than in other forms of composition. Quintilian (IX. 4. 72) lays down the general rule that a clause should not open with the beginning of a verse or close with the end of one.

Bennett: At the end of a sentence certain cadences were avoided; others were much employed. Thus: -

(a) Cadences avoided.

— u u — u;

— u u u ;

(b) Cadences frequently employed.

— U — ;
 — U — U ;
 — U U U — U ;
 U — — U — ;

Gildersleeve: Much depends on the rhythmical order of words, for which the treatises of the ancients are to be consulted. Especially avoided are poetic rhythms. So, for example, the Dactyl (— U U) and the Spondee (— —), or the close of an Hexameter at the end of a period.

My investigation was not carried on thoroughly enough and did not cover ground enough to warrant any more definite conclusion that that Cicero does seem to be more influenced by the factor of rhythm than Caesar, and to this factor may be attributed a number of the irregularities at the close of the subordinate clauses in De Senectute and in Catiline I. and II.

These results are gathered from a study of only those subordinate clauses that were irregular at the end and stood at the close of the sentence:

Caesar I. and II: — U U , avoided 1

— U — , employed 1

Catiline I. and II.

— U U , employed 2

— — , employed 2

— — avoided and — U U used, 1

De Senectute:

(a) Cadences said by the grammars to be avoided:

__ __, employed 2

avoided 2

__ __ __, employed 9

avoided 4

avoided and employed 1

__ __ __ __ __, employed 1

avoided 6

__ __ __ __ __, Employed 2

(b) Cadences said by the grammars to be employed:

__ __ __, employed 2

__ __ __ __, employed 4

__ __ __ __ __ __, employed 1 (and __ __ __ avoided)

__ __ __ __ __, employed 2

(c) Cadences under (b) were employed but others under (b) would have been employed had the verb stood at the end:

__ __ __ employed, __ __ __ __ avoided 1

(d) Cadences under (b) were avoided and those under (a) employed:

__ __ __ avoided, __ __ __ employed 1

__ __ __ avoided, __ __ __ employed 1

(e) Cadences under (b) avoided:

__ __ __ __ avoided 1

- (f) Cadences under (a) avoided but others under (a) employed:

___ UU U avoided, ___ UU employed 3

___ ___ avoided, ___ UU ___ U employed 1

6. Further suggestions for study:

- a. Linking: I noted 10 (11) clear cases of linking with what followed similar to the instances of linking with what preceded that I have given. There were besides numerous other possibilities: for example, a verb put forward to link definitely with what had preceded.
- b. The possibilities for shades of emphasis were almost unlimited, as one might suppose. I found in Caesar I. and II. four striking instances of negatives that were made emphatic:

I, 7, 3: propterea quod aliud iter
haberent nullum

I, 18, 3: propterea quod illo licente
contra liceri audeat nemo

II, 33, 6: cum iam defenderet nemo

II, 35, 4: Quod ante id tempus accidit
nulli.

- c. There were a few instances [11 (12)] in

which the clause that was irregular was one of a number or series of clauses of which the rest were regularly closed.

- d. A dependent infinitive closed 11 (12) clauses, a participle (not part of the verb) 2, and a gerundive 1. For my purpose such clauses were practically closed by a verb form, and in the case of the dependent infinitives by part of the verb itself.
- e. There were in Catiline I. and II. two instances of eat in exsilium. Does eo tend to act somewhat as sum does?
- f. Does aio tend to act somewhat as sum does? (Evidence very scanty.)
- g. Do the compounds of sum tend to behave as sum does? (Evidence incomplete.)

These figures represent chiefly possum:

	<u>Main Clauses</u>		<u>Subordinate Clauses</u>	
	<u>Regular</u>	<u>Irregular</u>	<u>Regular</u>	<u>Irregular</u>
Caesar II:	1	1	10	2
<u>De Senectute</u> :	10	18	9	4

- h. Does Latin seek to avoid a succession of verbs?
- i. There were several instances of extremely long objects (comprising a series, for example), phrases in apposition, phrases that seemed a sort of an afterthought, etc. being placed after the verb of a subordinate clause.